

Senator LEVIN, is an example—there are also times when filibuster by amendment takes place and it becomes abusive.

I can remember sitting in the chair where the distinguished Senator from Ohio is now sitting and watching Senator Kennedy on the floor. He had a bill that would raise the minimum wage. We often get big, fat bills on the floor. This was a bill that I think was literally one page. It was the smallest, shortest bill because it was just changing a number, basically.

Hundreds of amendments—literally hundreds of amendments had been filed against it. When the majority leader is faced with that—many of them were completely nongermane and not relevant—when the majority leader is faced with a circumstance where hundreds of amendments are filed on a small bill like that, it is easy to see why you have to move forward by trying to limit the time because the whole rest of the session could have been devoted to that bill if you can't get control. If you can't get an agreement—and very often, agreement is withheld as to a fixed number of amendments—then you have no choice but to take your best shot with the bill by filling the tree.

Even if I am right that the number is 70, I contend that the number of what the minority might consider a malicious filling of the tree might be a number considerably smaller than 70. Many of them might be made necessary by the actions of the minority by offering hundreds of amendments and by refusing to enter into agreements to offer a reasonable number.

I think it is a problem, but I think on balance I stand by the view I have expressed before that there is an unprecedented level of obstruction in this body, and I say that with some humility because the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has been here a bit longer. I have been here only for 6 years. But that is what people who have been here for many, many years confirm—that there has been really nothing like it.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business for debate only be extended until 5 p.m., with Senators to speak up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask to speak for 15 minutes but probably not that long.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FISCAL CLIFF

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I will speak off the topic of the day. Obviously, we are focused on the fiscal

cliff. The measure is now over in the House, and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and the senior Senator from California expressed their hope—and I would say confidence—that the House will act. Given the dysfunction of the House and its Republican leadership, I am perhaps a little bit more cautious than they are about this.

I remember that we did a very good bipartisan highway bill here. It passed with an enormous vote of 70-some, if I remember correctly, and went over to the House. They could not even pass a highway bill. They had no bill at all. They got so snarled up that finally they passed a bill that did nothing but to appoint conferees to argue about our bill. They could not bring a bill of their own into conference.

We worked very hard on a farm bill here. It was a bipartisan farm bill. Senator STABENOW was particularly energetic in that, as was her colleague from Kansas. Again, that was a bipartisan bill, which required a lot of hard work and had many compromises. We are in a terrible drought—which is something I will talk about more in a moment—and they cannot pass the farm bill over there.

The Speaker tried to respond to having withdrawn from his negotiations with the President on the fiscal cliff by coming up with a new so-called Plan B alternative. He could not even get that through his caucus. There is an unprecedented degree of extremism and dysfunction in the House Republican caucus, and I hope that does not disrupt the progress we have made on the fiscal cliff. We will have to wait and see. Today will tell.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. What I am here to talk about is not the topic of the day because the fiscal cliff is the topic of the day. What I am here to address is never the topic of the day. It is the unmentionable issue; that is, climate change. It is so apparent now that changes in our climate and in our environment are occurring from pole to pole and from the height of our atmosphere to the depths of our oceans. The overwhelming majority of scientific research, indeed statistically the now virtually unanimous scientific view, indicates that all these observed changes in the Earth's atmosphere are the direct result of human activity—specifically the emission of carbon dioxide from our burning of fossil fuels.

If we continue with these destructive levels of carbon pollution, carbon change will not just alter our environment, it will alter our economy. Very often discussions in Washington steer away from things that have to do with environment and the health and enjoyment of human beings of the natural world and instead it comes down to money, as it so often does in this town.

Let's talk about climate change in the context of money. Markets and businesses across this country have de-

veloped to fit the prevailing environmental conditions in their different regions of the United States. These markets and these businesses are going to face real challenges when our climate changes those prevailing conditions. Whether it is higher sea levels, stronger storms, warmer winters or dryer summers, no State and no economy will be unaffected by climate change.

We are already seeing real-life examples of economic consequences of a rapidly changing environment. The Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture reported that 80 percent of American agricultural land is experiencing drought, making this the most expensive drought since the 1950s—more than half a century ago. Last month, Deutsche Bank Securities estimated that the drought will reduce 2012 economic growth in the United States by one-half to 1 percent.

Shipping on the Mississippi River has been reduced and may stop in areas where drought has left water levels too low for safe passage. The American Waterways Operators and the Waterways Council estimate that \$7 billion worth of commodities are supposed to ship on the Mississippi in December and January alone. An interruption of that would have a considerable economic effect. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has begun a \$10 million project to clear rocks from the waterway to prevent that shutdown. The other option is to release water from the Missouri River, but that would just draw down water supplies in upriver States that are already suffering from drought themselves, such as Montana, Nebraska, and North Dakota.

Water is also essential for power generation. According to the U.S. Geological Survey, powerplants account for nearly half the daily water withdrawn in the United States. Drought and heat go hand in hand to push powerplants toward shutdown. A 2008 drought put several powerplants in the Southeast within days or weeks of shutting down. Texas, California, and the Midwest now face a similar challenge with drought stressing their power production.

In the Northeast, it is not low water but warm water that caused the shutdown of Unit 2 at the Millstone powerplant in Connecticut. The temperature of the water in Long Island Sound, from which the plant draws its cooling supply, climbed to over 75 degrees Fahrenheit this summer—too warm for cooling the Newark reactor. Of course, the cost to our economy of disruptions in our power supply is particularly high during warm weather, when energy use is at its height to run air-conditioners.

Scientists tell us the droughts and heat waves will get worse and water temperature will continue to increase. Agriculture, shipping, and power industries will be operated under new baseline environmental conditions.

Warmer oceans, ocean acidification, and extreme weather events create an